

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION No 1165 of 1998

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE S.K.KESHOTE

- =====
1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO
  2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
  3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO
  4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO
  5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

-----  
NAVINCHANDRA RAMSHANKAR THAKAR

Versus

JAYANTIBHAI JETHALAL CHANDPURA  
-----

Appearance:

MR JN JADEJA for Petitioner  
MR DC DAVE for Respondent No. 1  
-----

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE S.K.KESHOTE

Date of decision: 17/02/2000

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties,  
I do not find any illegality much less it cannot be said  
to be a case where the court below has committed any  
material irregularity in exercise of its jurisdiction in  
passing of the impugned order.

2. Earlier identical application filed by the petitioner for similar relief has been rejected. That order had been challenged in the revision application and that has also been dismissed. Again for same relief, this application has been filed and the court below has not committed any error in rejecting the same. The petitioner is a tenant and there is all possibility that he would have made an attempt to delay the proceedings of the eviction suit. He has applied for the certified copies of the documents from the Corporation. That application was submitted in the year 1987 and in case he would have pursued the same the documents would have been received by him. Merely because the documents were not received by the petitioner, it is not a ground for him to file repeated applications. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that in the revision application, the revisional court has permitted the petitioner to file fresh application is devoid of any substance. I read the order of the revisional court at page No. 1 which is referred by the counsel for the petitioner and wherefrom I find that it is the petitioner's own statement and not the revisional court's order.

3. In the result, this revision application fails and the same is dismissed. Rule discharged. Interim relief, if any, granted by this court stands vacated. No order as to costs.

\*\*\*\*\*

zgs/-